FILE COPY

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
OCT 5 1964
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM

No. 561

STATE OF LOUISIANA,

Respondent,

versus

DUDLEY DUPLESHIN,

Realtor.

Application for a Writ of Certiorari and Review, Directed to the Honorable Leo W. McCune, Judge of the Juvenile Court for the Parish of Jefferson, and the Supreme Court for the State of Louisiana.

APPLICATION ON BEHALF OF DUDLEY DUPLESHIN, REALTOR.

H. ALVA BRUMFIELD,
GARLAND R. ROLLING,
Attorneys for Dudley Dupleshin.

MONTGOMERY & CO., "THE BRIEF SPECIALISTS", 1107 POYDRAS ST., N. O., LA.

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM

No. .....

STATE OF LOUISIANA,

Respondent,

versus

DUDLEY DUPLESHIN,

Realtor.

Application for a Writ of Certiorari and Review, Directed to the Honorable Leo W. McCune, Judge of the Juvenile Court for the Parish of Jefferson, and the Supreme Court for the State of Louisiana.

APPLICATION ON BEHALF OF DUDLEY DUPLESHIN, REALTOR.

REFERENCE TO OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL REPORTS OF OPINIONS DELIVERED BY COURTS BELOW

1. Decision by the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana denying writs of certiorari, (certified copy contained in the record attached to proceedings, unreported in bound volume at time of filing writ)

2. Decision by the Juvenile Court for the Parish of Jefferson. (none reported but copy of same certified attached to the proceedings)

JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction of this Honorable Court is invoked on the grounds that Petitioner's rights have been violated as guaranteed to him by the 14th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Judgment was rendered by the highest Court of the State of Louisiana, being the Supreme Court thereof, on June 30, 1964, denying Petitioner right of review. Under the rules of the Supreme Court of Louisiana no petition for rehearing from a denial of a review is permissible.

STATE AND FEDERAL STATUTES AND CASES CITED

1. Louisiana State Revised Statutes 14:81
2. United States Constitution, Amendment 14
3. *Lane v. Brown*, 83 S. Ct. 768 (1963)
4. *Draper v. State of Washington*, 83 S. Ct. 774 (1963)

STATEMENT OF CASE

Dudley Dupleshin was duly charged in the Juvenile Court with the violation of R.S. 14:81 and convicted and given a six (6) month sentence in the Parish Prison.

An appeal was duly filed from this conviction and the same was dismissed on the joint motion of the Assistant District Attorney and counsel for defendant due to the fact that in accordance with the previous decisions of the Supreme Court of Louisiana sentences of six (6) months or less were not appealable.

The trial in this matter lasted over several days and there was testimony from the juvenile investigating officer, the defendant, his wife and other neighbors. There

was also the testimony of the minor child's mother, inasmuch as the Judge had excluded the minor child's testimony since he ruled that she was incompetent to testify.

The only evidence that points to defendant's guilt whatsoever was the testimony of Debra Guggenheimer's mother as to what Debra had told her defendant had done to her. This was rank and file hearsay evidence and objected to by counsel of defendant, but nonetheless the Judge admitted it. Debra discussed this matter with her mother many hours after the alleged happening of the event.

Little or none of the testimony of this case was ever taken down or transcribed and, in fact, the record herein contains no testimony since none was even taken down other than on one day of the trial. The Judge called in a reporter to take down certain of his statements as well as certain testimony which apparently has never been transcribed and forms no part of this record.

Further, approximately 95% of the proceedings were never recorded.

ERRORS ASSIGNED

1. It is error for a trial court to convict a defendant where there was no evidence whatsoever pointing to his guilt.

2. It is error to fail to furnish defendant a recording and transcription of the proceedings on which he was convicted. Such a failure denies defendant due process of law as guaranteed him by the Constitution of the United States, Amendment 14.

Lane v. Brown, 83 S. Ct. 768 (1963)
Draper v. State of Washington, 83 S. Ct. 774 (1963)

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that this Honorable Court should issue a writ of certiorari and review and ultimately that the judgment of the trial courts should be reversed or in the alternative a new trial granted.

H. ALVA BRUMFIELD,
GARLAND R. ROLLING,
Attorneys for Defendant,
319 Metairie Road,
Metairie, Louisiana.

STATE OF LOUISIANA
PARISH OF JEFFERSON

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, personally came and appeared,

GARLAND R. ROLLING,

who after being by me first duly sworn, did depose and say:

That he is attorney for the defendant, and that he prepared the writs in this case and supervised the copying of all the documents, and to the best of his knowledge and belief the proceedings, the court minutes and all of the other documents attached hereto are true copies of the originals;

That all of the allegations in the petition for writs are true and correct; and

That a copy of this petition has been delivered to the Honorable Leo McCune, Judge for the Juvenile Court for the Parish of Jefferson, and to Mr. Richard Thalheim, Assistant District Attorney, and the Supreme Court of Louisiana.

Garland R. Rolling

Sworn to and subscribed before me, this 28th day of September 1964

Notary Public

JUDGMENT OF THE DISTRICT COURT

9/26/63 Taken up on Motion for new trial, testimony of Mrs. McDaniel and Mrs. Hebert heard, motion submitted, motion for new trial denied. Defendant sentenced to six months in Parish Prison. Motion for appeal filed by attorney for defendant returned 1/12/63

JUDGMENT OF THE SUPREME COURT

State of Louisiana June 30, 1964

v.

Dudley Dupleshin No. 47,356

In re: Dudley Dupleshin applying for writ of certiorari and review.

Writ refused.

There is no error of law.

/s/ FWS
/s/ JBF
/s/ JBH
/s/ FWH
/s/ EHMcC
/s/ WBH
/s/ JWS

A TRUE COPY
Clerk's Office
Supreme Court of Louisiana
New Orleans, June 30, 1964

/s/ Harold A. Moise, Jr.
Deputy Clerk

[SEAL]

FILE COPY

FILED
MAR 3 1965
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

No. 561

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1964

STATE OF LOUISIANA,

Respondent,

v.

DUDLEY DUPLESHIN,

Relator.

Application for a Writ of Certiorari and Review, Directed to the Honorable Leo W. McCune, Judge of the Juvenile Court for the Parish of Jefferson, and the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana

ORIGINAL BRIEF ON BEHALF OF STATE OF LOUISIANA, RESPONDENT

JACK P. F. GREMILLION,
Attorney General,
State of Louisiana,
2201 State Capitol,
Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

M. E. CULLIGAN,
Assistant Attorney General,
State of Louisiana,
104 Supreme Court Building,
301 Loyola Avenue,
New Orleans, Louisiana.

FRANK H. LANGRIDGE,
District Attorney,
24th Judicial District,
Courthouse Building,
Gretna, Louisiana.

RICHARD A. THALHEIM,
Assistant District Attorney,
24th Judicial District,
Courthouse Building,
Gretna, Louisiana.

SUBJECT INDEX

	Page
Table of Cases and Statutes Cited	i
Opinion of Lower Courts	1
Basis of Jurisdiction	1
Constitutional Provisions Involved	2
Issues Presented for Review	3
Statement of the Case	4
Argument	5
Conclusion	7
Certificate	9

Table of Cases and Statutes Cited

Louisiana Cases Cited:

State v. Bennett, 235 La. 987, 106 So. 443.... 6

Statutes Cited:

Louisiana Revised Statutes 14:81 4

Louisiana Revised Statutes 15:499 6

Louisiana Revised Statutes 15:500 6

Louisiana Revised Statutes 15:502 7

No. 561

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1964

STATE OF LOUISIANA,

Respondent,

v.

DUDLEY DUPLESHIN,

Relator.

Application for a Writ of Certiorari and Review, Directed to the Honorable Leo W. McCune, Judge of the Juvenile Court for the Parish of Jefferson, and the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana

ORIGINAL BRIEF ON BEHALF OF STATE OF LOUISIANA, RESPONDENT

OPINION OF LOWER COURTS

The opinion of the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana is reported at:

246 La. 595 (official) and at
165 So. 2d 485 (unofficial)

BASIS OF JURISDICTION

Relator is before this Court on an application for a writ of certiorari and review based on the grounds that his rights have been violated as guaranteed to him by the 14th amendment of the Constitution of the United States because the Supreme Court of the

State of Louisiana denied his application for a writ of certiorari and review and a rehearing from a denial of a review is not permissible.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

This case involves the following provision of the Constitution of the United States:

(1) "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; now deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." United States Constitution, Amendment XIV, S1.

This case involves the following provision of the Constitution of the State of Louisiana:

(1) "In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall have the right to a speedy, public and impartial trial in accordance with the provisions of this constitution. All trials shall take place in the parish in which the offense was committed, unless the venue be changed; except that the Legislature may provide for the venue and prosecution of offenses when one of the acts constituting an offense or an element of the offense occurs in a parish of this state and other acts or elements thereof occur out of the parish or state, or when an

offense is committed in this state but the exact place of the commission of the offense in this state cannot be established. The Legislature may provide for the venue and prosecution of offenses committed within 100 feet of the boundary line of a parish. The accused in every instance shall have the right to be confronted with the witnesses against him; he shall have the right to defend himself, to have the assistance of counsel, and to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor. Prosecution shall be by indictment or information; but the Legislature may provide for the prosecution of misdemeanors on affidavits; provided, that no person shall be held to answer for capital crime, unless on a presentment or indictment by a grand jury, except in cases arising in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger. No person shall be twice put in jeopardy of life or liberty for the same offense, except in his own application for a new trial, or where there is a mistrial, or a motion in arrest of judgment is sustained." Louisiana Constitution, Article I, S 9.

ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

The relator urges that he was convicted by the trial judge where there was no evidence whatsoever pointing to his guilt and secondly that it was error to fail to furnish him a recording and transcription of the entire proceedings on which he was convicted.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Dudley Dupleshin was tried under a bill of information filed in the Juvenile Court for the Parish of Jefferson, State of Louisiana for the crime of "Indecent Behavior with Juveniles", Louisiana Revised Statutes 14:81, which crime is a misdemeanor.

On July 18, 1963, about 4:00 P.M., Debra Guggenheimer, four (4) years old, was at the home of Dupleshin playing with Dupleshin's dogs and while at his home, Dupleshin took Debra into the bedroom and placed his finger into her vagina and rectum.

It is a fact that the Court would not permit Debra to testify as he felt that she was incompetent, she being only 4 years of age. However, the State did place on the stand the mother of Debra, who testified as to the date of birth of the child on direct examination. When counsel for the State attempted to have Debra's mother testify on direct examination as to the conversation between herself and Debra, the trial Court sustained the objection of counsel for Dupleshin and did not at that time permit Debra's mother to testify further. Counsel for Dupleshin then placed Debra's mother on cross examination and questioned her at length with reference to the time that Debra had spoken to her on July 18, 1963. When he had completed his cross examination, counsel for the State on redirect examination then went into the matter of the conversation between Debra and her mother, which the Court permitted at this time since Counsel for Dupleshin brought it out on cross examination. Debra's

mother testified that Debra told her that Mr. Dudley had put his finger in her "booty", which she explained was what she had taught Debra to call her rectum and also had put his finger in her "du du", which she explained was what she had taught Debra to call her vagina. Mrs. Guggenheimer also testified that Debra was red around her vagina and rectum. This conversation between Debra and her mother took place at approximately 6:00 P.M. on the same date of the occurrence of the crime. Counsel for Dupleshin did object to this testimony, but the Court overruled his objection stating that the question of the conversation between Debra and her mother was brought out in cross examination by Counsel for Dupleshin and the State had a right on redirect examination to now go into the conversation. No bill of exception was reserved to the ruling of the Court nor was any bill whatsoever perfected.

The Court found Dupleshin guilty of the crime charged and ultimately sentenced him to serve a term of six (6) months in the Parish Prison.

Writs were denied by the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

ARGUMENT

May It Please The Court:

Since no bills of exceptions were reserved and perfected by Counsel for Dupleshin throughout the trial, nor was there any error patent on the fact of the record pointed out to the Supreme Court of the

State of Louisiana, there was nothing for them to review. *State v. Bennett* 235, La. 987, 196 So. 2d 443.

The Procedure for reserving bills of exceptions is set forth in Louisiana Revised Statutes 15:499 which provides:

> "On the trial of all Criminal cases, whenever a bill of exceptions shall be reserved to the ruling of any objection, the Court shall at the time and without delay order the Clerk of Court or stenographer to take down the facts upon which the objection and the ruling are based, together with the objection, the ruling and the reasons of the ruling, which statement, objection, ruling and reasons, so taken down, shall be preserved among the records of the trial, and shall, when signed, by the judge, constitute the bill of exceptions; provided that whenever a bill has been reserved the judge may be coerced by mandamas to sign the same."

Louisiana Revised Statutes 15:500 provides:

> "The bill of exceptions must show the circumstances under which and the evidence upon which the ruling complained of is based; and the accused is without right to have taken down any evidence except that which is necessary as a basis for his bill; he cannot require that any evidence be taken down that pertains to guilt or innocence."

The purpose of these two sections is to provide a record for the Court in the event of an appeal. As stated before, no bills of exceptions were reserved or perfected by Counsel for Dupleshin.

Louisiana Revised Statutes 14:502 provides:

"No error, not patent on the face of the record, can be availed of after verdict, unless objection shall have been made at the time of the happening of such error and unless at the time of the ruling on the objection a bill of exceptions shall have been reserved to such adverse ruling."

There is nothing in the record to show that Dupleshin was an indigent person nor that any request was made by him requesting a stenographer to record the entire proceeding. Counsel for Dupleshin was not an attorney appointed by the Court to represent him.

There was no denial of due process of law to Dupleshin for failing to furnish him a recording and transcription of the entire proceedings. The State of Louisiana provides the method whereby a defendant can make up his record and it is set forth hereinabove in the Statutes quoted.

There was evidence adduced in the trial court sufficient to sustain the conviction of Dupleshin, that being the testimony Mrs. Guggenheimer relative to the acts committed on her daughter by Dupleshin and the redness of the areas mentioned.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, the defendant had a legal trial and all of the rights guaranteed to him under the laws of the State of Louisiana and of the United States and their respective constitutions were

properly safeguarded. The application for a writ of certiorari and review should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

JACK P. F. GREMILLION,
Attorney General,
State of Louisiana.
2201 State Capitol,
Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

M. E. CULLIGAN,
Assistant Attorney General,
State of Louisiana,
104 Supreme Court Building,
301 Loyola Avenue,
New Orleans, Louisiana.

FRANK H. LANGRIDGE,
District Attorney,
24th Judicial District,
Courthouse Building,
Gretna, Louisiana.

RICHARD A. THALHEIM,
Assistant District Attorney,
24th Judicial District,
Courthouse Building,
Gretna, Louisiana.

CERTIFICATE

I, Michael E. Culligan, a member of the Bar of the United States Supreme Court, hereby certify that this _____ day of February, 1965 a copy of the above and foregoing brief was served on H. Alva Brumfield and Garland R. Rolling, 319 Metairie Road, Metairie, Louisiana, by depositing same in the United States Mail, postage prepaid.

_____

Of Counsel

B-129, 2-65